Reply to Office Action dated: November 26, 2007

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed July

25, 2007. A Petition for Extension of Time is submitted herewith, together with the appropriate

fee.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed July 25, 2007, Claims 10, 13, 15-26, 28-31, 34, and 36-

39 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§112 as lacking proper antecedent basis. Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being

directed to non-statutory matter. Claims 10, 13, 15-26, 28-31, 34, and 36-39 were rejected

under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,058,958,

hereafter Shutt) in view of Candan et al. ("Enabling Dynamic Content Caching for Database-

Driven Web Sites", hereafter Candan).

II. <u>Summary of Applicants' Amendments</u>

The present Response amends Claims 10, 19, 29, and 31, and cancels Claim 30,

leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 10, 13, 15-26, 28-29, 31, 34, and 36-

39.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action mailed July 25, 2007, Claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112

as lacking proper antecedent basis. Specifically, the Examiner could not find support for "a

machine readable medium" in the specification. It is respectfully submitted that paragraph [0079]

(of the specification in the printed publication) provides proper support for "a machine readable

medium." Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

In the Office Action mailed July 25, 2007, Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Accordingly, Claim 30 has been canceled. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

8

V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action mailed July 25, 2007, Claims 10, 13, 15-26, 28-31, 34, and 36-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,058,958, hereafter Shutt) in view of Candan et al. ("Enabling Dynamic Content Caching for Database-Driven Web Sites", hereafter Candan).

Claim 10

Claim 10 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 10 defines:

10. (Currently Amended) A method for transferring content to a plurality of content repositories, comprising:

identifying a content in at least one of a file system and a website by traversing the at least one of a file system and a website;

associating a schema with the content;

communicating with a virtual content repository (VCR) via an Application Programming Interface (API) to provide the content and the schema to the VCR for inclusion in one or more of a plurality of content repositories, wherein the VCR integrates the plurality of content repositories into a logical content repository, and wherein the API presents a unified view of the plurality of content repositories as a single repository and enables navigation of the plurality of content repositories; and

storing the content and the schema in a node in one or more of the plurality of content repositories;

wherein the schema is metadata that describes the node's properties.

Claim 10, as amended, defines a method for transferring content to a plurality of content repositories, comprising identifying a content in at least one of a file system and a website by traversing the at least one of a file system and a website, associating a schema with the content, communicating with a VCR via an API to provide the content and the schema to the VCR for inclusion in one or more of a plurality of content repositories, wherein the VCR

Reply to Office Action dated: November 26, 2007

integrates the plurality of content repositories into a logical content repository, and wherein the API presents a unified view of the plurality of content repositories as a single repository <u>and enables navigation of the plurality of content repositories</u>, and storing the content and the schema in <u>a node in</u> one or more of the plurality of content repositories, wherein the schema is metadata that describes the node's properties. Applicants respectfully submit that these

features are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

In the Office Action mailed July 25, 2007, column 11, lines 1-2 of Shutt was cited as disclosing *providing a schema* to a virtual content repository which is stored in one or more of the plurality of content repositories. However, it is respectfully submitted that Shutt, read in context, does not disclose the above claim feature. Shutt, from column 10, line 55 to column 11, line 17, discusses one implementation of the client programming model using the Managed Code Client Specification developed by Microsoft that runs under .NET. Managed code, in the context of .NET, is code that has its execution managed by the .NET Framework Common Language Runtime (CLR). Code written to target the .NET Framework compiles to a Common Intermediate Language (CIL) assembly, which is a CPU-and-platform-independent instruction set that can be executed in any environment that supports the .NET framework. To enable the CLR to provide services to manage code, the .NET compiler generates and stores (within the CIL assembly) metadata during compilation that describes all classes and class members that are defined in the assembly, and the classes and class members that the current assembly will

call from another assembly.

Thus, when Shutt discusses that managed code using the .NET framework uses metadata "blueprints" for managing components, one of ordinary skill in the arts would understand that Shutt is clearly referring to the metadata generated during compilation that is used to, for example, locate and load classes, lay out instances in memory, resolve method invocations, generate native code, enforce security, and set run-time context boundaries, but that the metadata referred to in Shutt is clearly not metadata that is provided to and stored in a virtual content repository for inclusion in one or more of a plurality of content repositories.

10

Reply to Office Action dated: November 26, 2007

In view of the above comments, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 10, as

amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and

reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 19, 29, and 31

For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 10, Applicants respectfully

submit that Claims 19, 29, and 31 are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the

cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 13, 15-18, 20-26, 28, 34, and 36-39

Claims 13, 15-18, 20-26, 28, 34, and 36-39 are not addressed separately but it is

respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable

independent claim and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully

submit that Claims 13, 15-18, 20-26, 28, 34, and 36-39 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor

obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It

is also respectfully submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them

patentable in their own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations

should it become necessary in the future.

Claim 30

Claim 30 has been canceled by the current Response, rendering moot the rejections of

this claim. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to prosecute the canceled claim in a

continuing or future application.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the

claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration

thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the

undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for

extending the time to respond up to and including November 26, 2007.

11

Reply to Office Action dated: November 26, 2007

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 26, 2007 By: ___/Guanyao Cheng/

Guanyao Cheng Reg. No. 58,555

Customer No. 23910 FLIESLER MEYER LLP 650 California Street, 14th Floor San Francisco, California 94108 Telephone: (415) 362-3800